

# Project Closeout Report

**Project Name:** Legislative Applications Replacement Project

**Agency:** Legislative Branch

**Business Unit/Program Area:** Legislative Council

**Project Sponsor:** John Olsrud

**Project Manager:** Jim Gienger

| Project Objectives   | Measurements    |             |
|--|-----------------|-------------|
|  | Met/<br>Not Met | Description |
| This section is not applicable since the project will not be completed until late 2008. Refer the "Success Story" section for accomplishments to date. |                 |             |

| Schedule Objectives |                              |                           |                 |
|---------------------|------------------------------|---------------------------|-----------------|
| Met/<br>Not Met     | Scheduled Completion<br>Date | Actual Completion<br>Date | Variance        |
| Met                 | 6/1/2007                     | 5/16/2007                 | Under schedule. |

| Budget Objectives |                 |                     |               |
|-------------------|-----------------|---------------------|---------------|
| Met/<br>Not Met   | Baseline Budget | Actual Expenditures | Variance      |
| Met               | \$737,397.00    | \$737,367.00        | Under budget. |

| Major Scope Changes |
|---------------------|
| None.               |

| Lessons Learned  |
|--|
| <p><b>Statement of Work</b> – The SOW needs to describe significant detail so project objectives and deliverables are well understood by all stakeholders. Many entities need to participate in the review process due to the complex nature of these documents. As such, a great deal of time should be allocated to this process (2 months for us).</p> <p><b>Communication</b> – A communication plan needs to be developed and followed to ensure all stakeholders are kept as informed as they need to be. Communication vehicles may include status reports, product data sheets, project artifacts and deliverables, presentations, prototypes, meetings, conference calls, or demonstrations. Information sharing needs to be timely and include as much detail as is required by the receiver of the information. Too much communication never contributes to project failure. We need to do a better job of communicating during project implementation.</p> |

| Success Story   |
|---|
| <p>NDLC is pleased with the progress made during Phase I and Phase II – Catalyst. Phase I consisted of the following deliverables approved by the Legislative Management Committee in October 2006:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>Business Process Analysis:</i> The Business Process Analysis document reflects the business processes supporting the North Dakota Legislative Branch and its bill drafting and legislative management activities. Its purpose is to define and describe events, and areas of responsibility within each business functional area. In addition, this document identifies business and technical requirements, work flow, document and data flow, processes, policies, and procedures executed during the legislative process.</li> <li><i>Functional Specifications:</i> During this activity the business processes were decomposed into the following functional components; Collaboration, Content Creation, Content and Change Management, Information Sharing, Retention and Archiving, Reuse, and Workflow Management. Several components were identified that are critical to supporting the business processes. They include data collection,</li> </ul> |

content creation, content management, and publishing. Every use case was described and categorized by functional component.

- *Architectural and System Schematics:* This document provides the architectural specifications for the system infrastructure. The main sections describe the “current-state” architecture, the “future-state” architecture, the set of conceptual components that comprise the architectures, and sample deployment views of use cases.
- *Technical Specifications:* This document provides a software view of the functional components described in the functional specifications. This document complements the System Design document by providing details of the software subcomponents.
- *System Design:* This document provides the system’s level of detail. The architectural components are described along with providing information on implementation, security, desktop standards, disaster recovery, and metrics for standards. This document complements the Technical Specifications document.
- *Cost Benefit Analysis and Return on Investment Analysis:* The Cost Benefit Analysis and Return on Investment document provides an accounting based view to show that the primary business objectives of this project have been met.
- *Solution Budget:* This document provides an estimation of the costs associated with implementing the proposed Phase II solution as outlined in the System Design and Technical Specification documents.
- *The Microsoft Project Plan:* This document details the milestones, tasks and resources necessary to meet the Phase II implementation objectives.
- *Proof of Concept:* This is a more focused demonstration that shows a specific set of use cases applied to the proposed set of tools and technologies. The proof of concept (POC) represented a slice of functionality across a range of business processes. Many of the coded objects will be reused during the Phase II implementation. A POC Profile document was created describing the function demonstrated.

Following Phase I, PTC recommended a Phase II Catalyst stage to accelerate the timelines for the Phase II effort. The Legislative Management Committee approved proceeding with the Phase II Catalyst and work began in December 2006 with completion scheduled for May 2007. The Phase II Catalyst consists of the following approved deliverables:

- *Business Process Validation:* This activity matched verifiable metrics and measurements to the use cases and business process.
- *Foundation Layer Implementation:* Several of the development components were established.
- *Conference Committee System Development:* A custom java application was developed implemented during the 2007 Legislative Session.

Appropriation for the Phase II implementation was established during the 2007 Legislative Session. Full Phase II implementation will now begin.